



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# The American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION AT ST. LOUIS<sup>1</sup>

“POSCIMUR”, if one may borrow an exordium from Horace, and freely translate it, “We are put to it”. It is expected and required of the editor of the *American Historical Review* that in each April number there shall be one article “covering” the then recent annual meeting of the American Historical Association. It is a large order, when a meeting consists of twenty-five sessions, held in eleven different places, and in some instances held three or four at a time, and including in the aggregate at least sixty-five papers. It may be that so prodigious a bill of fare is welcome to most of those who attend, each member being sure to find something that interests him, something that lies in or near his “specialty”. It may be that no one but the reporter of the proceedings is confused by their multiplicity. Yet sometimes the thought arises, that it is not the soundest appetites which are ministered to by the complicated hotel *menu*, and that healthy minds might well ask the question,

What neat repast shall feast us, light and choice,  
Of Attic taste?

The experiment of a simple programme of high quality might well be tried, and might have unifying effects of considerable value.

Howsoever these things may be, the attempt to deal with the St. Louis meeting must nevertheless be made. No one has the right to expect that such a chronicle shall be highly readable, but perhaps it is possible this year to lighten it by some omissions. By decree of the Association a year ago, upon recommendation from the Committee on Policy, it was resolved that hereafter a carefully composed summary of each paper read at any meeting should appear in the *Annual*

<sup>1</sup> Another account of the meeting, by Dr. Daniel C. Knowlton, will be found in the *Historical Outlook* for March, 1922.

*Report*, whether the full text of the paper were printed in that volume or elsewhere or not at all. In view of the fact that some account of each paper will thus be accessible in print, it may be less necessary than heretofore that each should be summarized in these pages.

It added to the diversity, though also to the pleasure and interest of the occasion, that several other historical societies met at St. Louis during the same days, December 28, 29, and 30, 1921. With the Agricultural History Society, which by treaty has an organic relation to the American Historical Association, there were two joint sessions devoted to the agricultural history of the United States. With the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, many of whose members are also members of the older body, there was a joint session devoted to topics in the earlier economic history of the Mississippi Valley, and that society had also a subscription dinner on the evening of the 27th. The American Catholic Historical Association also began its sessions with a dinner on that evening; this was followed on the ensuing days by sessions comprising many interesting papers in American and European church history, by fruitful practical conferences on the general bibliography of church history, on Catholic archives in the United States, and on Catholic historical publications, and finally by a general session in which Professor James J. Walsh, president of the society, read his presidential address, on the Church and Peace Movements in the Past. Much active interest, with promise of much useful work in the future, was manifested in the meetings of all three of these societies. Two other organizations which convened at the same time were the Missouri Historical Society, of St. Louis, and the State Historical Society of Missouri, of Columbia, both of which participated in the exercises of the second evening, when there was a general session commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union in 1821.

But besides the elements of diversity, there were of course also elements making for unity. The hotel in which headquarters were established, the Planters Hotel, gave abundant opportunities for conversation and sociability. The Missouri Historical Society entertained the guests, on one of the evenings, at the City Club, with a "smoker" for the men and a reception for the women; and there were several occasions on which the society came together as a whole, and not in specialized sections. Most notable of these was the dinner offered to all the members by the trustees of the Missouri Botanical Garden, founded as an institution thirty-three years ago by the will of Henry Shaw of St. Louis. After the dinner an address of welcome was delivered by Dr. Frederic A. Hall, chancellor of Washing-

ton University; and the president of the Association, the French ambassador, Mr. Jusserand, delivered the brilliant and instructive address which we have the honor to print on later pages of this number.

Another unifying, and very agreeable, occasion was the luncheon hospitably offered by Washington University on the second day, which gave members a gratifying opportunity to see the noteworthy campus and buildings of that institution, in whose halls most of the exercises of that day took place. To these should be added two general sessions, in which, with no alternative programmes to attract them elsewhere, members listened to the commemoration of the Missouri centennial, already mentioned, and to a group of papers in French history; at the latter session—held, it will be remembered, on soil that once was French—the ambassador of France presided.

The local arrangements, despite the number of places involved, ran very smoothly. For them the Association was indebted to the local committee headed by Mr. William K. Bixby and Mr. Charles P. Pettus, and especially to Professor Thomas M. Marshall, of Washington University. Evidently the committee must have exerted itself valiantly on the side of publicity also, for the St. Louis newspapers gave the meeting an amount of attention to which the Association is not accustomed; ordinarily, in the cities where the Association meets, the newspapers devote less space to the lucubrations of the historians than to the local weather, the latest bankruptcy, or the firemen's ball.

By a very gratifying action on the part of the railroad authorities, a reduction of fares such as used to be granted before the war was accorded once more on this occasion, though the number of attendants required in order to secure the concession was placed at a height which it will often be difficult for the combined societies to reach. The registration of the American Historical Association at this thirty-sixth annual meeting was 325, as against 360 at the thirty-fifth. The difference is only such as could be accounted for by the greater distances by which Western members are separated from St. Louis as compared with those which separate the average Eastern member from Washington, and the attendance may be regarded as excellent even upon pre-war standards.

The chairman of the Committee on the Programme was Professor Evarts B. Greene, who provided what was, by general agreement, an unusually interesting programme.

In accordance with the customary form of these annual surveys, one may well report first upon the various practical conferences, before speaking of those papers which lend themselves more readily to

a systematic or chronological order. First, then, of the conference on the teaching of history in schools. Its topic was that which has been so anxiously debated in recent years, that of the relations in the school curriculum between history and the other social sciences or studies. The two papers which served as the basis of discussion were one by Professor Rolla M. Tryon, of the University of Chicago, describing various forms of adjustment practised in elementary and secondary schools—independent courses, simultaneous or successive, in history and the cognate studies, and courses in which all these elements are fused, during either the whole or the earlier part of the curriculum—and one by Professor Eugene M. Violette, of the State Teachers College at Kirksville, Missouri, on the various adjustments possible in the curriculum of the college. The discussion showed plainly the perplexities of the present situation, the uncertainty as to how the contending claims of all these studies upon the pupil's time and mind, or, more exactly, upon the minds of school superintendents, can be reconciled. It would appear that it can only be done by joint effort of the representatives of all these studies in some one organic body. With this in view, though many efforts at solution of the problems may prove helpful, especial interest attaches to those undertaken by the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies,<sup>2</sup> a body formed for just such co-operative study, and in which it was intended that the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society should each be represented. The Executive Council of the Association, at this session, requested the Committee on History Teaching in the Schools to take an active part in the movement of co-operation which seems to be indicated as affording the best pathway out of the existing perplexities, and appointed as its representatives two members of that committee, Professors Henry Johnson and Arthur M. Schlesinger.

In the conference of archivists, the question how the states can be persuaded to take better care of their archives was discussed in the light of the experience of Iowa, with many helpful practical suggestions, by Mr. C. C. Stiles, of the Iowa State Department of History, and in the light of Connecticut experience by Mr. George S. Godard, of the Connecticut State Library. Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, chairman of the Association's Public Archives Commission, read a history of its achievements during the twenty-two years of its existence, and there was some discussion of its future, in view of the fact

<sup>2</sup> More recently named National Council for the Social Studies; see *post*, pp. 491-492.

that the reports upon the contents of state archives, which have constituted its chief published work, are now nearly completed.

The conference of historical societies, which enjoys a certain degree of autonomy under the auspices of the Association, elected Mr. Paltsits as its president for the next two years. Two papers were read in its session. In the first, Dr. Newton D. Mereness described the different varieties of Historical Material in Washington having Value for the Individual State—papers in the War Department relating to frontier defense, in the Indian Office relating to Indian relations, in the Department of State relating to the administration of territorial governments, in the Post Office Department relating to the development of communications and transportation, in the General Land Office on land matters, and in the House and Senate files on all these subjects. Dr. Theodore C. Pease, of the Illinois State Historical Library, in a paper on Historical Materials in the Depositories of the Middle West, showed how collections of historical material in that region had developed under a succession of concepts as to what constitutes history—from that view which made it consist almost solely in glorifying the heroes of the frontier and the wars of the republic, to the study of past politics as history, and ultimately to broadening inclusion of the economic, social, and religious aspects of the history of the state and of the whole region of which it forms a part.

For less formal consideration of special fields in which groups of members have a practical and effective interest, there were several "luncheon conferences", and a "dinner conference" of those especially interested in the work of the hereditary patriotic societies. At the preceding annual meeting the Council had appointed a special committee on relations with these societies, and this committee, under the efficient chairmanship of Professor Dixon R. Fox, of Columbia University, has made considerable progress in drawing the representatives of those societies into common consultation on matters of historical interest.

The topics of the respective luncheon conferences were: the history of science, that of the Great War, English history, American colonial history, Hispanic-American history, and the history of the Far East. The original intention respecting these conferences, when they were instituted, some years ago, was that they should be occupied with free and informal discussion, especially with practical discussion as to what tasks or problems most deserved to have the labor of scholars expended upon them, and in what manner that labor might best be directed, the prime objects being the exchange of experience

and the promotion of scientific work. But though these conferences, as they now run, by no means lack those elements of interest, in the main they have come to consist of formal written papers, often no different in character from those read in the main sessions—and no shorter. It would seem as if college professors, accustomed to talk informally to classes several times a week, might cut loose on these occasions from written texts, and, if there are tasks in their fields which they wish to urge others to engage or co-operate in, tasks suffering to be undertaken, might be aware of the superior hortatory power which resides in the spoken word as compared with the ten-minute or thirty-minute “paper”.

The free and characteristic talk of Professor Breasted on wheat in ancient Egypt, and like topics, in the conference on the history of science, and that of Professor Haskins on opportunities for research in the history of science afforded by European libraries, were examples of the value and attractiveness of this method. Another theme interestingly handled in that conference was that of Professor Archer B. Hulbert, of Colorado College, the various ways in which the natural sciences can be invoked to aid in the study of American history.

In the conference on the history of the Great War, Dr. Wayne E. Stevens, of Dartmouth College, described, with illustrations, the critical problems involved in the use of the official records of that war, problems of both external and internal criticism, attended by difficulties arising out of the enormous volume and varied character of the material, the multitude of inaccurate and unauthentic versions of documents, the haste with which documents were prepared, their technical language, and the various factors of human and military fallibility. Captain Shipley Thomas described the contribution made to the history of the war by a group of officers of the American Expeditionary Force, mostly regimental intelligence officers, one from each combat-unit, who were assembled at Langres for the purpose, a few days after the armistice, and for two months were occupied with the study and discussion of the military operations in which they had taken part.

In the “luncheon conference” on English history, Professor Arthur L. Cross, of the University of Michigan, indicated the dangers involved in the growing tendency to lay the chief emphasis, in historical teaching, on recent history and world-history. Also he pointed out the advantage of legal history as a teaching instrument. A paper on this subject, the need of the study of legal history by the law student or by college students preparing for the law school, by Professor Clarence C. Crawford, of the University of Kansas, was

read at this luncheon, and one by Professor Clarence Perkins, of the University of North Dakota, on Electioneering in the Time of Sir Robert Walpole.

The conference on American colonial history realized most completely the original ideal of these conferences, the speakers directing attention to a large number of fields calling urgently for more thorough research and indicating methods or materials for their cultivation. Thus, Professor Root of Wisconsin dwelt on the financial relations between England and the colonies as deserving further study, Professor Bond of Cincinnati on studies concerning colonial agents and concerning the relations between different regions in the colonial period, Professor Gipson of Wabash College on possibilities in the field of eighteenth-century colonial biography.

In the conference on Hispanic-American history, Professor Hackett, of the University of Texas, described the materials for Spanish history to be found in the library of the late Señor Genaro García of Mexico, recently acquired by that institution; Dr. Arthur S. Aiton of Michigan discussed the establishment of the viceroyalty in the New World, under Mendoza, as a projection into that continent of a Spanish institution which had already had a long development in Spain itself; and Professor Robertson of Illinois read a paper on the policy of Spain toward her revolted colonies in 1823-1824.

Finally, in the conference on the history of the Far East, Professor Rostovtseff of Wisconsin sketched the history of the influence of the art of Central Asia on South Russia and China, and a paper was read on Prince Shotoku and the Taikwa Reform in Japan in 645 A. D., by Mr. Langdon Warner, director of the Pennsylvania Museum in Philadelphia.

Of the more formal sessions devoted to the reading and consideration of formal papers, the one which had the widest scope, and which may therefore deserve to be first spoken of, was a session devoted to the history of civilization. In opening it, its chairman, Professor Breasted of Chicago, in an extended paper, entitled *New Light on the Origins of Civilization*, adverted to the new opportunities for exploration and study in the Near East opened up by recent events, and to the want of adequate organization in America for exploiting these opportunities. He then passed to a description of the organization and methods of the Oriental Institute established at the University of Chicago, its collections, and its undertaking to edit, with much European aid, those early Egyptian coffin-inscriptions, archaic forerunners of the Book of the Dead, which should present us with our first chapters in the history of religion and morals. He then de-



scribed his very interesting and fruitful archaeological expedition of 1920 in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and Syria. Finally, from general considerations respecting the origins of civilization, he passed to the origins of science in particular, and described the contents of the Edwin Smith medical papyrus of the sixteenth century B. C., now belonging to the New York Historical Society.

In the same session, Professor Ferdinand Schevill, of the same university, speaking on the Relation of the Fine Arts to the History of Civilization, maintained with emphasis that the history of the fine arts could not be brought into accord with those theories respecting progress which are now dominant in the study of history. General Eben Swift, U. S. A., had a paper upon the Development of the Art of War, Professor William L. Westermann, of Cornell University, on historical aspects of Commerce and Economics, especially on the difficulties attending their treatment in respect to periods prior to the existence of trustworthy statistics.

In a session specially devoted to economic history, Professor N. S. B. Gras, of the University of Minnesota, read a paper on the Development of Metropolitan Economy in Europe and America, which we shall have the pleasure of printing in a later number. That of Professor Harry E. Barnes, of Clark University, on the Significance of Sociology for Economic and Social History, dwelt on the impossibility of treating these subjects suitably without possessing an adequate knowledge of sociology, and of sociology in its latest and most satisfactory and most inclusive forms. While sociology, he said, furnishes the historian with his knowledge of the principles and patterns of human behavior, with which alone he can proceed intelligently in historical synthesis, the historian can provide the sociologist with invaluable genetic and comparative data, by recourse to which the sociologist can vastly improve the breadth and accuracy of his subject. "There is no danger of sociology engulfing or absorbing history. There will always be an ample opportunity for productive labor in gathering the concrete material descriptive of human progress." The last part of the paper was given to specific illustrations of the workings of the chief sociological factors in history.

The papers on ancient history, in the session set apart for that subject, were all concerned with the history of the Roman Empire. Recent Advances in our Knowledge of that field were indicated by Professor A. E. R. Boak, of Michigan, who adverted especially to the modern debates respecting the nature and theory of the principate, the worship of the emperor, the growth of the bureaucracy, the origin of the colonate, the religious transformations, the influence of Egypt

and of Parthia. Professor Frank B. Marsh, of Texas, endeavored to show to what extent and in what sense we may rightly regard the Empire as a Continuation of the Republic, and, urging the need of emancipating our minds from the influence of literary sources originating in the Antonine period, argued that Augustus made a serious effort to conform his settlement of the world to the old republican and aristocratic tradition. Professor Charles H. Oldfather, of Wabash College, described the chief varieties of New Light from the Papyri, dwelling particularly on their contribution to our knowledge of administration and of economic conditions in Egypt.

Of the papers in medieval history, that of Professor August C. Krey, of Minnesota on the International State of the Middle Ages and Some Reasons for its Downfall, may be expected to appear ultimately in the pages of this journal. That of Professor Louis J. Paetow, of California on the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries in the History of Culture, was largely a plea for a fuller study of medieval Latin, and even for its use as an international language in our time. That of Professor Lynn Thorndike, of Western Reserve University, on Guido Bonatti, dealt with an astrologer of the thirteenth century, placed by Dante in the eighth circle of the Inferno, and especially with his *Liber Astronomicus*.

Mention has already been made of an afternoon session occupied with the history of France. Of its five papers, four related to French history of the last two hundred years, one, that of Professor Earle W. Dow, of Michigan, to a medieval theme, that of Town Privileges under the "Établissements de Rouen", a subject which derives its importance from the fact that the Rouennese system was adopted, wholly or in part, by some thirty or more French towns, from the Channel to the Pyrenees. The ducal or royal charters of various dates from 1144 to 1278, and the communal Établissements, were carefully analyzed, their development traced, and allusion made to the light they cast on municipal life. Professor Albert F. Guérard, of the Rice Institute, followed with a paper, of marked excellence of literary quality, fair and discriminating, on Voltaire's Philosophy of History, as shown in the *Essai sur les Mœurs*, the *Histoire de la Civilisation*, and the *Siècle de Louis XIV.*, and on the rational humanitarianism which he represented. Monsieur Bernard Faÿ, of Paris, in a paper characterized by similar felicity of expression, yet by much evidence of research, discussed the close relations between the Revolutionary Philosophy in France and in the United States at the End of the Eighteenth Century—Luzerne's press, Vergennes's *Nouvelles d'Angleterre et d'Amérique*, the manner in which the young

French revolutionaries brought American ideas of politics and morals to bear on bourgeois minds (moral ideas more permanently than political), and, after the moral bankruptcy of the Directory, the manner in which Madame de Staël, Benjamin Constant, Châteaubriand used their ideas of American society in their efforts toward a new Catholicism. Professor Fling, of Nebraska, gave a sketch of the history of the French Revolution; Professor Hazen, of Columbia University, described the Part which France has played in Liberating Other Countries—Greece, Belgium, Rumania, and Italy.<sup>3</sup>

Europe after the Congress of Vienna was the general subject of another session, with papers by Professor William A. Frayer, of Michigan, *A Criticism of the Italian Settlement of 1815*; by Professor Robert J. Kerner, of Missouri, on Nationalism and the Metternich System; by Professor Parker T. Moon, of Columbia University, on British Jealousy of French Imperialism after 1815; and by Professor J. M. S. Allison, of Yale University, on the July Days and After. Professor Frayer urged that, Italy having no man capable of ruling the whole peninsula, to divide it again into individual states checking and balancing each other was a more defensible policy than had commonly been thought, and indeed was practically inevitable. Dr. Kerner drew from the failure of Metternich's policy of repressing nationalism a hundred years ago the lesson that, however nationalism may prove to be outworn in regions of Europe already industrialized and otherwise economically advanced, it marks a necessary stage in the evolution of the new, chiefly agricultural, states lying to the eastward. Professor Allison's main effort was to account for the failure of the government of Louis Philippe. He considered its downfall to have been due, not to the laborers, but to the radical leaders, who, though unorganized and discordant, were able, under the leadership of the Friends of the People, to take sufficient advantage of the ministry's instability to wreck the general control.

In the session arranged for military history, after a paper by Col. Charles R. Howland, U. S. A., on the Causes of the World War, Col. Conrad H. Lanza read one on the Fifty-fifth Division on September 29, 1918, of particular interest to a St. Louis audience because that division consisted largely of Missouri and Kansas troops. The incident discussed occurred in the Ardennes, the division having a position on the right bank of the Aire. An attack which it was to make on the morning of the day named proved a failure, and the division was "withdrawn for reorganization", but Colonel Lanza showed in detail that the responsibility for the failure must be widely

<sup>3</sup> Printed in the *North American Review* for April.

distributed, that it was due to misunderstandings and blunders on the part of many officers in army, corps, division, and brigade staffs.

Few if any of the sessions evoked more interest than that which was devoted to the history of the American Revolution. It gave gratifying evidence that, though school-board politicians and members of legislatures still regard that history as solely a series of military events, in which the children of light, uniformly animated by the most glorious and unexampled patriotism, were uniformly victorious over the base children of darkness, serious students of history in increasing numbers take a rational view of the episode, and study it as they would study any other portion of history, with an eye chiefly to the political and social developments involved. This was made especially manifest in the discussion which followed the papers, in which Professors McLaughlin, Becker, Schlesinger, and Morison all took an illuminating part, and which, in a degree unusual in our meetings, was real discussion. The papers were two. Professor Claude H. Van Tyne, of Michigan, in his paper on the American Revolution in the Light of the Last Two Decades of Research, described and critically discussed the contributions made to a sounder knowledge of the period by various investigators, including the late George L. Beer and Professors Alvord, Becker, and Andrews, with exposition of the present-day opinion.

In the other paper, entitled *In re* the American People *vs.* George III., Professor Clarence W. Alvord, of Minnesota, opposed to the older habit of ascribing all objectionable legislation to the sole influence of George III. the need of more thorough and discriminating study of the views and actions of the politicians who surrounded him. Dr. Alvord maintained the hypothesis that the factions of George Grenville and of the Duke of Bedford, desiring vindication for the repeal of the stamp tax, were the leaders in ministry and Parliament who caused the American Revolution. The active causes in the colonies were the financial depression succeeding the French and Indian War, the development of a non-English people in the colonies, and the propaganda put forth first for political purposes and then for the gaining of independence. The remarks of Professor Schlesinger included some very pertinent suggestions as to lines along which the history of this propaganda might well be further pursued.

The other period of American history to which a session was given was that of the generation following the Civil War. Mr. Paul L. Haworth, of Indiana, opened the session by a discussion of the Emergence of the Problems of the Period out of War and Reconstruction. The question of the status of the former Confederates

and of that of the seceded states proved comparatively simple. The problem of the negro was more difficult, and remains unsolved, though by reason of his having been left economically dependent upon his former master no very acute labor problem has arisen. But in the years from 1865 to 1877 financial problems of great importance claimed attention, problems connected with the debt, the tariff, and the currency, and in the field of economics the stimulation of manufactures accelerated the transition from the agricultural to the industrial age, forcing to the front new questions, for whose solution the American mind was ill prepared.

Professor Theodore C. Smith, of Williams College, illustrated the Congressional dealings with these problems, and especially with those of finance, in a paper on Light on the Period from the Garfield Papers. The collection was described as a rich mine of information on Congressional and party history from 1863 to 1880, but especially for the period after 1875, when, the Democratic party controlling the House, Garfield became "floor leader" of the Republican minority. When his own party was in power, his advocacy of resumption and of tariff reform had prevented him from becoming chairman of the committee of ways and means.

Three of the papers read in this session were devoted to the consideration of fields of study and research still imperfectly cultivated. Professor Arthur C. Cole, of the Ohio State University, discussed the application of the principles of historical criticism to newspapers and periodicals, and, since adequate direct use of these voluminous sources by the general historian has become a physical impossibility, urged the building-up of systematic means for their intelligent use through the making of a large number of careful monographs on various phases and various examples of modern American journalism. Professor Francis A. Christie, of the Meadville Theological School, treating of the Field of Religious Development, set forth as the most conspicuous movement of the period the national organization, or drawing together, of loosely related churches, combined with a shifting of emphasis to ethical and philanthropic interests; hence such developments as the Christian Commission and Sanitary Commission of the Civil War, the Conferences of the Evangelical Alliance, the Federal Union of the Churches of Christ, and the various interdenominational lay societies. Several of these deserve fuller study. Another factor was the development in the theological schools, with large consequences in clerical and other minds, of a scientific method for dealing with the data of religion. Fields awaiting full and dispassionate treatment are the progress of efforts toward social reform,

the marked adaptation of Catholic churchmanship to the principles of American political life, and the vogue of a new conception of divine grace in the circle of Christian Science and New Thought. Miss Ella Lonn, of Goucher College, propounded a remarkably wide variety of questions calling for investigation in the political, financial, economic, social, and cultural history of the South after Reconstruction, specifically of the years 1875-1890.

The papers read in the two joint sessions held with the Agricultural History Society happily combined the history of American agriculture with that of American social conditions. Thus, Professor Archer B. Hulbert, of Colorado College, discoursing of the Soil Factor in Pennsylvania and Virginia Colonization, showed how the abundant wheat crops of the Lancaster County region in Pennsylvania enabled that region to take the lead in furnishing the means of transportation—developing the Conestoga horse, the Conestoga wagon, the first turnpike, the first canal of any length—and, with these and its manufacture of firearms, in promoting the earlier waves of migration toward the West. Dr. Joseph Schafer, of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, showed how the *Wisconsin Domesday Book*, the plan of which has been heretofore described in this journal, and which is being prepared under his supervision, casts abundance of fresh light—the light of exact data in place of tradition—on the processes of pioneer settlement in one state at least, and illuminates the character of land speculation, the choices made of lands, the differing social results of settlement in forested and in prairie townships. In the paper by Professor William W. Carson, of De Pauw University, on Agricultural Reconstruction in North Carolina after the Civil War, two matters were mainly discussed: the transition from wage labor, experimented with in the first few years after emancipation, to the system of cultivation on shares; and the westward extension of cotton cultivation, by means of fertilizers, and that of tobacco, of varieties suitable to lands hitherto considered too poor for that staple.

The other three papers in agricultural history looked rather at the political relations of agricultural industry and life. Professor Theodore C. Blegen, of Hamline University, had as his theme the Scandinavian Element and Agrarian Discontent. Sketching the early history of agricultural settlement on the part of the Scandinavians, and their relation to the Republican party down to the nineties of the nineteenth century, he attributed their defections from that party, at that time and later, to the general agrarian movement, particularly the Farmers' Alliance and Population, and to the influx of immigrants unfamiliar with the Republican tradition. The Scandinavians have

been influenced almost exclusively by economic and political, rather than by racial reasons; the habit of independent voting has continued. In quite another quarter, Professor Melvin J. White, of Tulane University, traced the Influence of Agricultural Conditions upon Louisiana State Politics during the Nineties, from the initial discontent of the small white farmer of the hill parishes, and his adhesion to the Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party, through the movements of fusion with the Republicans in 1892 and 1894, to the electoral reforms of 1896 or the constitutional convention of 1898, which redressed most of the grievances of which the People's Party had complained. The paper by Professor Edward E. Dale, of the University of Oklahoma, on the Cattle Ranching Industry in that state, was mainly concerned with governmental relations and with influences of the industry upon the development of the West and upon the country as a whole. He described with skill the rapid growth of the business, the extraordinary and spectacular developments which led to its downfall and to the opening of Oklahoma to agricultural settlement, and the incompetence of Congress and government to deal with a situation involving an industry so technical.

Very naturally and appropriately, one of the sessions was devoted to papers commemorating Missouri history. Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, of the St. Louis bar, described the state constitution of 1820, the general course of legislation under it, and the experiences which led to extensive modifications of the governmental system in the constitution of 1875. Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker, secretary of the State Historical Society of Missouri, set forth a variety of incorrect Traditions concerning the Missouri Question and a variety of paradoxes in Missouri history, urging a closer and a broader study of its development.<sup>4</sup> Under the title, *A Sidelight on the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise*, Dr. H. Barrett Learned presented an investigation, based on contemporary newspapers and the papers of Philip Phillips, M. C. from Alabama at the time of the repeal, designed to show that Phillips's careful formulation of an amendment to the Nebraska Bill about January 19, 1854, probably influenced the ultimate form of that bill. Professor William O. Lynch, of Indiana University, in a paper on the Influence of the Movements of Population on Missouri History before the Civil War, analyzed the population according to origins, period by period, and showed how ineffective relatively were the efforts of pro-slavery and anti-slavery partisans to direct immigration into Kansas at the height of the Kansas conflict; between 1850 and 1860 Tennessee contributed to Missouri eleven times the number

<sup>4</sup> For these two papers, see the *Missouri Historical Review* for January.

of people that she furnished to Kansas, Kentucky five times the number, and even New England sent more settlers to Missouri. In 1860 Missouri ranked seventh in population among the Union states; she also ranked seventh in the number of soldiers sent to the Union armies.

Last of the sessions, and last to be here spoken of, was one held in concert with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, of which the general theme was the economic history of the Mississippi Valley. Professor Cardinal Goodwin, of Mills College, read a paper on the Fur Trade and the Northwest Boundary, 1783-1818, a topic closely allied to that of Professor Bemis's article printed on later pages of this journal. Mrs. N. M. Miller Surrey, of New York, who on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington is compiling the *Calendar of Manuscripts in Paris Archives relating to the Mississippi Valley* devised originally by a committee of the Association, drew from her great repository of notes the materials for a paper on the Growth of Industries in Louisiana, 1699-1763, full of new and detailed information, especially on the development of agricultural industries in that colony during the French period. For a later period, Professor Albert L. Kohlmeier, of Indiana, showed the relations between Commerce and Union Sentiment in the Old Northwest in 1860, demonstrating how, despite the commercial attachments of the northern part of the region to the northeastern states and of the southern portion to those of the southeast, which caused discord and hesitation in 1860, conditions of greater force held the region to unity, and by the middle of 1861 gave Union sentiment an overwhelming majority.

It is difficult, perhaps it is unnecessary, to generalize respecting papers so numerous and so multifarious. Many contributed new matter or new points of view, some made little or no such contribution. There was a gratifying tendency, which we believe to be general in the historical profession since the war, to pursue subjects having real importance, episodes which have had significant consequences or aspects of history which the interests of the present day have made worth while, as distinguished from topics which are pursued because it has been the conventional habit of our guild to pursue them, *idola tribus*, so to say. On the whole, it seems that most of the papers were good, but that few were of extraordinary excellence. Certainly few of the papers by Americans showed any of that gift of expression, those fruits of wide reading, which marked the papers of the two Frenchmen, and many were distinctly ill-written.

It remains to record the results of the business meeting of the Association, at which the first vice-president, Professor Haskins, pre-



sided. The secretary's report showed a total membership of 2,633, as compared with 2,524 reported a year ago, a gain of 109 members. The treasurer's report showed receipts of \$13,264, expenditures of \$12,584, but it is to be noted, from the summary of his report printed at the end of this article, that the excess of receipts over expenditures, \$680, is almost entirely accounted for by the receipt of \$650 in life-membership fees, which by vote of the Association are to be kept, as is proper in such cases, in a separate fund. Still further it is to be noted that \$2,904 of the receipts was derived from the voluntary contributions, additional to annual dues, which members have made in response to the invitations sent out in company with the annual bills. Therefore the need of a larger regular revenue remains apparent, and the constitutional amendment proposed last year, increasing annual dues from three dollars to five, and life-membership fees from fifty dollars to one hundred, beginning with September 1 next, was voted without dissent. It is hoped and believed that the change, in which the Association only follows at last a step which the analogous societies have already taken, will not cause the withdrawal of more than a very few, if any, of the members; and an increased revenue will enable the Association to resume or promote activity along several lines of investigation or other work which in recent years its poverty has compelled it to suspend or renounce. Meanwhile, the large response to the suggestion of contributions has given most gratifying evidence of the interest which members have in the Association and of their desire to sustain it effectively. The budget proposed by the Council is printed on a later page.

The amendment to the by-laws, relative to discontinuance of the primary ballot for nominations to office and to membership in the nominating committee, printed a year ago in this journal (XXVI. 436), was rejected; it was voted that the portion of the by-laws referred to should be so interpreted as not to make the results of the preliminary ballot mandatory upon the Committee on Nominations, but merely an aid in the making of its recommendations.

It was voted, upon hospitable invitation from Yale University and upon recommendation from the Council, that the annual meeting of December, 1922, should be held in New Haven. The Council recommended that that meeting should begin not earlier than Wednesday morning, December 27, and should close not later than Saturday noon, December 30. It was recommended that the meeting of December, 1923, be held in Columbus.

Reports from several committees were presented, and an oral report on behalf of the Pacific Coast Branch, by Professor Robert C.

Clark, its official representative on the present occasion. On report from the Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize, that prize was awarded to Dr. Einar Joranson, of the University of Chicago, for an essay on the Danegeld in France. This may be the best place in which to mention that the award of the Justin Winsor prize, delayed a year ago, was finally made to Mr. F. Lee Bennis, of the University of Indiana, for an essay on the American Struggle for the British West Indian Carrying-Trade, 1815-1830. A series of rules for the award of the George Louis Beer Prize, for the "best work upon any phase of European international history since the year 1895", was proposed by the committee appointed a year before, and adopted by the Association. Copies can be obtained from the assistant secretary. A committee of five was appointed for award of the prize. The annual elections followed precisely the list presented by the Committee on Nominations. Professor Charles H. Haskins was elected president for the ensuing year, Professor Edward P. Cheyney first vice-president, Honorable Woodrow Wilson second vice-president. Professor John S. Bassett and Mr. Charles Moore were re-elected secretary and treasurer respectively. The eight elective members of the Executive Council were all re-elected, none of them having yet served the usual three years. For the Committee on Nominations to be presented next autumn, the Association chose Professors Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, William E. Lingelbach, Nellie Neilson, and William L. Westermann; the committee has since chosen Professor Bourne as chairman. The Council elected Professor William E. Dodd a member of the Board of Editors of this journal, in the place of Professor Van Tyne, whose term had expired. A full list of the committee assignments for 1922 follows this article.

J. F. J.

#### AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

That in article III. there be substituted for "three dollars", "five dollars"; and for "fifty dollars", "one hundred dollars"; so that the article shall read:

Any person approved by the Executive Council may become a member by paying five dollars, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of five dollars. On payment of one hundred dollars any person may become a life member, exempt from fees. Persons not residing in the United States may be elected as honorary or corresponding members and be exempt from the payment of fees.

*St. Louis Meeting of the*

## SUMMARY OF TREASURER'S REPORT

## RECEIPTS

Balance on hand December 1, 1920.....	\$5,031.16
Receipts to date:	
Annual dues.....	\$7,059.71
Life memberships.....	650.00
Registration fees.....	54.25
Voluntary contributions.....	2,903.75
Publications .....	336.44
Royalties .....	78.11
Interest on investments.....	1,368.51
Interest on bank account.....	67.44
Special contribution from American Historical Review Fund.....	500.00
Miscellaneous .....	56.87
Transferred from Endowment Fund.....	188.91
	<hr/>
	13,263.99
	<hr/>
	\$18,295.15
Gift, George L. Beer Prize Fund.....	5,000.00
	<hr/>
Total receipts.....	\$23,295.15

## EXPENDITURES

Office of secretary and treasurer.....	\$2,928.77
Pacific Coast Branch.....	43.86
Committee on Nominations.....	46.93
Committee on Membership.....	23.85
Committee on Programme.....	383.15
Committee on Local Arrangements.....	100.26
Committee on Policy.....	39.75
Committee on Agenda.....	75.03
Committee on Bibliography.....	295.39
Committee on Publications.....	677.29
Committee on History and Education.....	300.00
Conference of Historical Societies.....	25.00
Writings on American History.....	200.00
American Council of Learned Societies.....	153.89
Robert M. Johnston Prize.....	250.00
American Historical Review.....	7,040.90
	<hr/>
	\$12,584.07
Investments .....	8,113.65
	<hr/>
	20,697.72
	<hr/>
Cash balance November 30, 1921.....	\$2,597.43

*Receipts*

## BUDGET, 1922

Annual dues .....	\$7,000.00
Registration fees .....	150.00
Publications .....	100.00
Royalties .....	50.00
Interest .....	1,400.00
Miscellaneous .....	50.00
	<hr/>
	\$8,750.00

*Expenditures*

Secretary and Treasurer .....	\$3,000.00
Pacific Coast Branch .....	50.00
Committee on Nominations.....	100.00
Committee on Membership.....	100.00
Committee on Programme.....	300.00
Committee on Local Arrangements.....	50.00
Conference of Historical Societies.....	25.00
Committee on Publications.....	700.00
Council Committee on Agenda .....	300.00
American Historical Review.....	7,000.00
Historical Manuscripts Commission.....	20.00
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.....	200.00
Writings on American History .....	200.00
American Council of Learned Societies.....	150.00
Committee on Bibliography .....	500.00
Committee on the Writing of History.....	75.00
	<hr/> \$12,770.00

Deficit, \$3,695.00

## OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

*President*, Charles H. Haskins, Cambridge.

*First Vice-President*, Edward P. Cheyney, Philadelphia.

*Second Vice-President*, Woodrow Wilson, Washington.

*Secretary*, John S. Bassett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

*Treasurer*, Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington.<sup>5</sup>

*Assistant Secretary-Treasurer*, Patty W. Washington, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.

*Editor*, Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington.

*Executive Council* (in addition to the above-named officers) :

James Ford Rhodes, <sup>6</sup>	William R. Thayer,
John B. McMaster,	Edward Channing,
Simeon E. Baldwin,	Jean J. Jusserand, <sup>6</sup>
J. Franklin Jameson,	Arthur L. Cross,
George B. Adams,	Sidney B. Fay,
Albert Bushnell Hart,	Carl R. Fish,
Frederick J. Turner,	Carlton J. H. Hayes,
William M. Sloane,	Frederic L. Paxson,
William A. Dunning,	Ruth Putnam,
Andrew C. McLaughlin,	James T. Shotwell,
George L. Burr,	St. George L. Sioussat.
Worthington C. Ford,	

## COMMITTEES :

*Committee on Programme for the Thirty-seventh Annual Meeting* :

David S. Muzzey, 492 Van Cortlandt Park Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y., chairman; Eloise Ellery, Walter L. Fleming, Charles Seymour, Wilbur H. Siebert; and (*ex officio*) Nils A. Olsen and John C. Parish.

<sup>5</sup> For the purposes of routine business the treasurer may be addressed at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

<sup>6</sup> The names from that of Mr. Rhodes to that of Mr. Jusserand are those of ex-presidents.

- Committee on Local Arrangements:* Max Farrand, Yale University, chairman.
- Committee on Nominations:* Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, chairman; William E. Dodd, William E. Lingelbach, Nellie Neilson, William L. Westermann.
- Editors of the American Historical Review:* Carl Becker, Archibald C. Coolidge, William E. Dodd, Guy S. Ford, J. Franklin Jameson, Williston Walker.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Justin H. Smith, 7 West Forty-third Street, New York, chairman; Annie H. Abel, Eugene C. Barker, Robert P. Brooks, Logan Esarey, Gaillard Hunt.
- Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Isaac J. Cox, Northwestern University, Evanston, chairman; Chauncey S. Boucher, Thomas F. Moran, Bernard C. Steiner, C. Mildred Thompson.
- Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Conyers Read, 1218 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, chairman; Charles H. McIlwain, Nellie Neilson, Louis J. Paetow, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Wilbur H. Siebert.
- Public Archives Commission:* Victor H. Paltsits, 48 Whitson Street, Forest Hills Gardens, Long Island, N. Y., chairman; Solon J. Buck, John H. Edmonds, Robert B. House, Waldo G. Leland.
- Committee on Bibliography* (including the *Manual of Historical Literature*): George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., chairman; Henry R. Shipman, 27 Mercer Street, Princeton, acting chairman; William H. Allison, Sidney B. Fay, Augustus H. Shearer. *Subcommittee on the Bibliography of American Travel:* Solon J. Buck, Milo M. Quaife, Benjamin F. Shambaugh.
- Committee on Publications:* H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington, secretary; and (*ex officio*) John S. Bassett, J. Franklin Jameson, Herbert A. Kellar, Justin H. Smith.
- Committee on Membership:* Louise F. Brown, 263 Mill Street, Poughkeepsie, chairman; Elizabeth Donnan, August C. Krey, Frank E. Melvin, Richard A. Newhall, John W. Oliver, Charles W. Ramsdell, Arthur P. Scott, John J. Van Nostrand, jr., James E. Winston.
- Conference of Historical Societies:* Victor H. Paltsits, 48 Whitson Street, Forest Hills Gardens, Long Island, N. Y., chairman; John C. Parish, State Historical Society, Iowa City, secretary.
- Committee on the National Archives:* J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, chairman; Gaillard Hunt, Charles Moore, Eben Putnam, Oliver L. Spaulding, jr.
- Editors of the Historical Outlook:* Albert E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, managing editor; Edgar Dawson, Sarah A. Dynes, Daniel C. Knowlton, Laurence M. Larson, William L. Westermann.
- Committee on Military History:* Eben L. Swift, Army and Navy Club, Washington, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, Thomas R. Hay, Eben Putnam, Oliver L. Spaulding, jr., Jennings C. Wise.
- Committee on Hereditary Patriotic Societies:* Dixon R. Fox, Columbia University, chairman; Natalie S. Lincoln, Harry B. Mackoy, Annie L. Sioussat, R. C. Ballard Thruston.

- Committee on Service:* J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, chairman; Elbert J. Benton, Clarence S. Brigham, Worthington C. Ford, Stella Herron, Theodore D. Jervay, Louise P. Kellogg, Albert E. McKinley, Herbert I. Priestley, James Sullivan.
- Committee on History Teaching in the Schools:* Guy S. Ford, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, Philip P. Chase, Henry Johnson, Daniel C. Knowlton, Albert E. McKinley, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Eugene M. Violette.
- Committee on Endowment:* Charles Moore, Library of Congress, chairman.
- Committee on Obtaining Transcripts from Foreign Archives:* Charles M. Andrews, 424 St. Ronan Street, New Haven, chairman; Gailard Hunt, Waldo G. Leland.
- Delegates in the American Council of Learned Societies:* J. Franklin Jameson, Charles H. Haskins.
- Committee on the George L. Beer Prize:* Bernadotte E. Schmitt, 1938 East 116th Street, Cleveland, chairman; George H. Blakeslee, Robert H. Lord, Jesse S. Reeves, Mason W. Tyler.
- Committee on Historical Research in Colleges:* William K. Boyd, Trinity College, Durham, N. C., chairman; E. Merton Coulter, Benjamin B. Kendrick, Asa E. Martin, William W. Sweet.
- Representatives in the National Council for the Social Studies:* Henry Johnson, Arthur M. Schlesinger.
- Special Committee on Bibliography of Modern English History:* Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Wallace Notestein, Conyers Read.
- Special Committee on the Historical Congress at Rio Janeiro:* John B. Stetson, jr., Elkins Park, Pa., chairman; Percy A. Martin, Stanford University, Cal., vice-chairman; James A. Robertson, 1422 Irving Street, N. E., Washington, secretary; Charles L. Chandler, Isaac J. Cox, Charles H. Cunningham, Julius Klein, Manoel de Oliveira Lima, Edwin V. Morgan, Constantine E. McGuire, William L. Schurz.
- Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government:* J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, chairman; Charles Moore.
- Committee on the Writing of History:* Jean J. Jusserand, French Embassy, Washington, chairman; Wilbur C. Abbott, John S. Bassett, Charles W. Colby.